

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.

Can We Have an Effective World Organization Without Russia?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

STEPHEN F. CHADWICK

CHARLES R. SAVAGE

CLARENCE K. STREIT

PETER H. ODEGARD

(See also page 12)

COMING

—July 31, 1947—

What Should Be Our Policy for Aiding Europe Now?

—August 7, 1947—

Is the Two-Party System Failing in America?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.





CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF JULY 24:

"Can We Have an Effective World Organization Without Russia?"

Mr. DENNY	3
Mr. STREIT	4
Dr. ODEGARD	6
Mr. CHADWICK	8
Mr. SAVAGE	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	17



THE BROADCAST OF JULY 31:

"What Should Be Our Policy for Aiding Europe Now?"



THE BROADCAST OF AUGUST 7:

"Is the Two-Party System Failing in America?"



The Broadcast of July 24, 1947, originated in the Civic Auditorium, Seattle, Washington, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., E.D.T., over the American Broadcasting Company network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Illinois U Library Town Meeting

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



JULY 24, 1947

VOL. 13, No. 13

Can We Have an Effective World Organization Without Russia?

Announcer:

Tonight we are in Seattle, Washington, Queen City of the Pacific Northwest, where we're the guests of our local sponsor, Friedlander and Sons, and Station KJR.

Seattle is one of the first cities in which we originated our Town Meeting on our first coast-to-coast tour in 1941. This marks our fourth visit to this industrial city, which is the gateway to Alaska and the Orient.

Washington, known as the Evergreen State, is popularly supposed to have a large share of rainfall. Well, actually, due to the position of the magnificent Olympic Mountains and the Japanese current, its rainfall is about average for the country, a comfortable 34 inches, compared with 57 for New Orleans, 40 for New York City, and 39 for Boston.

Seattle is the industrial capital and main port of the evergreen

empire, and its people are as fervently patriotic and proud as any people you'll find in America. From truck gardening to airplanes, they excel in whatever they do. And tonight their city is to be the center of a nationwide discussion of a worldwide problem.

And now we present our moderator, the President of Town Hall, New York, and founder of America's Town Meeting of the Air, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. I can't begin to tell you what a thrill it is to travel around this great country of ours originating these programs week after week, meeting the people, feeling their genuine hospitality, seeing the tremendous productive capacity of this country, both in agriculture and industry, and sharing with these people their intense interest

in the domestic and world problems we face together.

Let no one tell you there is any important isolation sentiment in America. The people of this country realize that science has made us citizens of the world.

Some of us are disturbed and confused by the events that are taking place around us, but the conscience of mankind is very near the surface today, and the American people appear to me more determined than ever to be guided by conscience rather than expediency in the solution of their problems.

The people of Seattle here are typical of this fine American spirit, and I know you'll be glad to join with them in this nationwide Town Meeting as we consider one of the most baffling—yes, one of the most irritating—of all questions we face, "Can we have an effective world organization without Russia?"

The battle cry of those who pushed the adoption of the United Nations Charter at San Francisco was, "We must get along with Russia! We must get along with Russia!" The voices of those who suggested that we might get along with Russia more effectively if we insisted upon democratic principles in the Charter were scarcely heard.

Now that we've had the United Nations for two years and see how difficult it is to get along with Russia within this world organi-

zation, some people are beginning to wonder if one day we could have a more effective world organization whether Russia comes along or not. Even the most spoken diplomats have voiced this opinion strongly, since the Pan-European conference on the reconstruction of Europe. But that's a topic we will discuss next week.

One of the most outstanding proponents of a federal union of the democracies without Russia has been Clarence Streit, author of *Union Now* and long-time correspondent of the *New York Times* at the old League of Nations in Geneva. He and Mr. Stephen Chadwick, of Seattle, former National Commander of the American Legion, will take an affirmative on tonight's question.

Dr. Peter H. Odegard, President of Reed College in Portland, and Mr. Charles Savage, businessman and labor consultant from Sheldahl, Washington, will uphold the negative. So, let's hear first from Mr. Clarence Streit, author of *Union Now*, and editor of *Freedom and Union*. Mr. Streit. (*Applause*)

Mr. Streit:

Mr. Moderator, nearly every one in this vast audience, I am sure, will agree on these four things:

First, that with World War marching toward us with its atomic bombs and German warfare, which can be much worse than German warfare, and with World Depression Number Two sneaking

ahead of it by way of European collapse, we do need an effective world organization and we need it now.

Second, that we do not have an effective world organization now in the United Nations.

Third, that we would have an effective organization — effective for peace, for prosperity, and for something I place above them both, effective for individual liberty — if the United Nations were organized as the United States is—as a federal union whose laws were made by the freely-elected representatives of the people, and were enforced with all the safeguards of the Bill of Rights on the citizen individually.

Fourth, that it is, unhappily, only too evident now that we cannot at present organize any such government with Soviet Russia, and, I would add, with a number of other nations.

What then? Must we take the drastic course of reorganizing the United Nations without Russia? Or must we choose the still more dangerous policy of doing nothing but wishfully think that we can get effective world law by agreement with Russia, and fiddle—addle our way into World Depression Number Two and World War Number Three.

We of Federal Union, the membership association that I have the honor to head, believe there is a way between these dire alternatives

where we can get effective world government started without Russia and yet avoid the danger of excluding Russia from the United Nations.

Our policy is summed up in the symbol of ours, which consists of two circles. The larger one represents the United Nations; the smaller one, a federal union of democracies within it. Above them both we place the torch of individual freedom.

We seek, in short, to apply on a world scale the principles that have proved effective in securing liberty, prosperity, and peace in the Western Hemisphere. There, also, two types of organizations exist. On the one hand there is the Pan-American organization, uniting all twenty-one republics. Each member has a veto, and each has its own armed force, currency, tariff, and citizenship.

But one member, the United States, is composed of forty-eight states, who have organized on different principles. Each of them is as independent as any Latin American republic in certain respects, but they do have a common defense force, a common currency, a common free trade market, a common citizenship, and a common federal government. Result—the union of the forty-eight states is so powerful and effective that no Latin American dictator would dream of attacking it, and because of its free institutions, the United

States does not dream of using its tremendous power to conquer its weaker neighbors.

This combination has preserved both freedom and peace much more effectively in the Americas than they have been preserved anywhere else on earth. If we had such a combination in existence on a world scale, the world would certainly be much more effectively organized than it is today.

How can we get it? Well, the United Nations already fills on a world scale the role of the Pan-American league. All we need do in that regard is to keep it as it is. We do not need to break it up, or amend it, or drive Russia out.

The real weakness in the U. N. is not Russia, but the fact that it contains no democratic member powerful enough to play the part in it that the U. S. plays in Pan-America. If the United Nations did include such a colossal democracy there would be no more agitation to abolish the veto and equip the U. N. with an Atomic Authority than there is now to improve the Pan-American organization in these respects.

Such a U. N. member can be created through forming a federal union of the world's most advanced democracies.

Who are they? I would nominate the United States, the British Commonwealth, France, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, and the Scandinavian countries. Federate merely

these fifteen in the kind of union the thirteen original states had and beside it Russia would see a pygmy in power.

Keep this in mind if President Odegard and Mr. Savage tell you this is dividing the world into two camps. Why, this Union of the Free would be much stronger than all the rest of the world put together! Because Russia would not attack it, and its free institutions would keep it from attacking others, time could be gained for the slower evolution necessary to bring together into an effective government all the nations of the world. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Clarence Streit. Now, may we hear from Dr. Peter H. Odegard, President of Reed College at Portland, the author of many important books in the field of sociology and politics, a former Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury. Dr. Odegard. (*Applause.*)

Dr. Odegard:

Thank you, Mr. Denny. Mr. Streit says that an effective international organization can be made without Russia. This I do not deny. We have effective international organizations for limited purposes which do not even include the United States.

The Charter of the United Nations recognizes the need for such limited or regional agree-

nents, but we can no more have an effective *world* organization to play without Russia than we could have an effective League of Nations after World War I without the United States.

Call them what you will—leagues, unions, or alliances—if the great powers are to make separate and independent deals with each other and their satellites on matters affecting the peace of the world, no effective world organization is possible. (*Applause.*) It was precisely that kind of diplomacy that undermined the League of Nations and made World War I inevitable. If we revert to it again, only a miracle can prevent World War III which may well seal the doom of us all.

What Mr. Streit and Mr. Chadwick know is that if we exclude Russia, we exclude not only the largest country in the world, but we exclude Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, and the occupied zones of Germany, Austria, and Northern Korea. Can we even be sure of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, or Iran, not to mention France or Italy, where powerful Communist parties exist?

Does anyone seriously believe that under these circumstances we can build an effective world organization without Russia? Since the war the Soviet Union has certainly been a hard customer to

deal with. Hence, the proposal—to use Sam Goldwyn's phrase—to include Russia out.

Through a policy of obstruction and aggression, she has lost a large measure of the good will her magnificent war record won. Her foreign policy has been governed by old-fashioned power politics, Communist ideology, and plain, stark fear.

She has behaved like a psychoneurotic, suffering from delusions of grandeur and persecution—delusions of grandeur such as the belief that the only salvation in the world is communism of the Russian variety, and delusions of persecution like the belief that the so-called capitalist states of the West are out to destroy the Communist fatherland.

On the other hand, such policies as control of the Dardanelles, a dominant position in Manchuria, North China, friendly or subservient states on the Baltic and the Black seas, were goals of Russian policy under the czars and have little to do with Communist ideology as such. They are old and familiar cards in the Russian game of power politics.

It is this combination of power politics, ideology and fear that have made Russia the Mephistopheles of contemporary world politics. It helps to explain Russian opposition to so many proposals made by the United States and other countries. It helps to

explain also why Russia clings to the veto power in the Security Council as a necessary measure of defense against what she professes to believe is a capitalist conspiracy against her.

To some extent, this myth of a hostile world has been cultivated for internal as well as external reasons. One of the major problems of Soviet leaders is to maintain their distatorial authority at home. It is easier to do this if the outside world is in fact, or can be made to appear to be, hostile.

It follows, therefore, that one sure way to play the Communist game, not only in external relations, but internally, is an attempt to organize the world which would exclude Russia. It would drive a wedge between the worlds, no matter what Mr. Streit may say, and make it even more difficult to find solutions for the critical issues that lie ahead. It would close the door to compromise and would, in effect, be a move in the direction, not of peace, but war.

The one hope for an effective and enduring world organization lies in collaboration among the great powers of the world and, in particular, between Russia and the United States of America. Because such collaboration is difficult is no reason for giving the cause up for lost and retreating again into isolationism, even though you call it "Union Now."

The American people have been in tighter spots before, and have refused to admit defeat. After Pearl Harbor, with our navy in ruins, our army a blueprint, most of Central Europe, Asia, and Africa in the hands of the enemy, and their forces triumphant everywhere—even, I say, in these days, we never doubted our ultimate victory. Why should we be less zealous, less courageous, less visionary, if you please, in the fight for peace? (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Dr. Peter H. Odegard. Now, our next speaker is a resident of Seattle who served in the last war in Siberia, now a distinguished attorney here, and former national commander of the American Legion—Mr. Stephen Chadwick. Mr. Chadwick. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Chadwick:

Dr. Odegard, Russia's conduct is not based alone on fear and suspicion. She follows a continuous and studied pattern of world communism with accompanying distatorship.

America has tried disarmament, a sharing of power; has outlawed war and adopted a neutrality; an attempt to share respect; extended lend-lease, an attempt to share this world's goods; has tried to exchange professors and students. With what res

—another war and continued misunderstanding.

The time is here and now for us to boldly declare that the welfare of humanity transcends the so-called rights of nations, and humanity must not allow Russia's retrogression to further delay or finally destroy human progress. (*Applause.*) It daily seems apparent that Russia and the satellites impressed within her sphere are not interested in the success and effectiveness of the United Nations.

Two conflicting ideologies exist: One, totalitarianism, where a group or class arrogates to itself the right to rule and govern, and is an essential of its philosophy makes the state in which it is dominant supreme.

The second, freedom, wherein man as an individual is dignified, his rights declared—as in our American Bill of Rights—the state does not exist as master but as servant, and the welfare of the group is determined by the peaceful, democratic process.

One is a police state, the other a free state. One requires force, the other desires the way of reason. The words fascist, communist, and dictator all imply totalitarian philosophy, antagonistic to freedom and free institutions.

An effective world organization can be accomplished only by those who are willing to forego a will to dominate, a will to aggression,

and who, for the sake of peace, are willing to live in a world of law and order.

A great American in 1916 said: "The supreme difficulty with the Hague is that there is no police power to enforce the decrees of the court. As things are now, such power to command peace throughout the world could best be assured by some combination between those nations which sincerely desire peace and have no thought themselves of committing aggressions." That was Theodore Roosevelt.

In 1916 another American said: "The difficulties cannot be overcome unless we try to overcome them. Probably it will be impossible to stop all wars, but it will certainly be possible to stop some wars and thus diminish their number." That was Henry Cabot Lodge.

It was unfortunate that those two statesmen did not support the League of Nations and that Senator Lodge became the leading figure in rendering it impotent. In defeat, President Wilson said: "When the final referendum is come, although in the meantime the cost in human life may be too great even to think about, civilization will do what it has to do to save itself."

Without an effective world organization of the free, World War II has been fought and won. The necessities of war made

strange allies. Victory was accomplished, the nations met. The purpose of the governments of the free was to effect a world organization that could accomplish peace. Totalitarian Russia insisted that a veto power be written into the charter, and the exercise of that power has rendered the organization ineffective. Incipient wars continue.

Recognizing such ineffectiveness, bipartisan groups of senators have introduced in our Congress important resolutions. One asks for the amendment and revision which will strengthen the United Nations as an instrument to prevent war and maintain world peace.

The other demands that our President take the initiative in creating world government by calling a general United Nations conference to make the United Nations capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war.

While we want peace with Russia, would welcome her dropping the iron curtain and abolishing the veto, and adopting world law with us, we can only expect her refusal.

With or without Russia we must have world law respected and enforced. (*Applause.*)

I would first amend the United Nations Charter. Why have two organizations to do the job? If Russia vetoes the amendments, then we must, of necessity, go our way.

A world organization with Russia's ten per cent of world population can keep peace with its own framework and would embrace such a percentage of world's population, natural resources, industrial capacity, spiritual endowment as would serve to check and stop totalitarian aggrandizement and march of enslavement. Such percentage of the human family federated under law, would be effective as a world organization. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Stephen Chadwick of Seattle. Now may we hear from Mr. Charles R. Savage, businessman, labor consultant, and former Democratic Congressman who helped to enact the U. N. Charter in the last Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. Savage:

Friction cannot be created with a solid block of wood, but if split apart the two pieces can start fire.

A world solidly united will solve its economic and political problems and maintain peace, but the friction of a world divided against itself will cause an atomic explosion that will be felt around the world and may wipe out every human being on earth.

Mr. Streit admits that he and Mr. Chadwick are off the beam. He proposes two organizations

one with Russia and one without her. He admits that the one without Russia would not be an effective world organization. It sounds like Georgia to me with her two governors.

The U. N. to be an effective world organization must accomplish at least the five following points.

First, maintain a United Nations army, a police force sufficient to protect every country from any aggressor.

Second, there must be constant and unrestricted inspection of all war potential in every country that could possibly attack another nation.

Third, all war potential must be limited, curtailed, or eventually outlawed altogether except for the use of the U.N. police force.

Fourth, atomic energy must be limited by international law to civilian purposes only. The atomic bomb, as soon as the U.N. police force can give protection and security, must be outlawed. There is no need for an atomic bomb in a peaceful world.

Fifth, the U.N. must aid countries in working out their economic problems and assist in preventing discriminatory trade barriers that would cause hardship and starvation. The U.N. is now working on part of this program.

We've got to do the right things first and follow with the others in the proper order. We must first

organize the police force to give protection, then as confidence is established in the world organization, member nations must be induced to curtail or eliminate war production. Then we'll be on the way to peace.

Sometime in the near future after the U.N. has proved itself, probably the United States and the four other countries will agree that the veto privilege can be eliminated and the U.N. be made a more democratic organization. Step by step, the U.N. can evolve into a real world government and a real permanent peace organization.

When we joined the U.N., we were getting in where a lot of countries would have a lot to say about many issues that would vitally affect our welfare. We were cautious and like the rest of the Big Five, we insisted on the veto until we could see what the U.N. could do. So you see, Mr. Chadwick, we are as responsible for the veto being in the Charter as any other country. (*Applause.*)

Now, could the U.N. effectively maintain a peace program without Russia? Let's see what conditions would prevail. The elimination of Russia from the U.N. would very likely mean, also, the elimination of six or seven other nations, making a total of 300,000,000 people—more than twice as many as there are in the United States.

Mr. Chadwick talks a lot about ideologies. The purpose of the

U.N. is not to sort out ideologies but to prevent aggression. When that is accomplished, wrong ideologies will fall of their own weight.

Here is the crux of the whole question. If Russia were not a member, the U.N. would not have the right to inspect or limit in any way her war production. She

would be free to arm to the teeth and would probably consider necessary to do so.

It is now possible with ger warfare to send an epidemic or plague to another country by rocket. It is now possible to shoot atomic rocket bombs from one place to any country on earth.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

CLARENCE K. STREIT — Mr. Streit is president of Federal Union, Inc., and the author of *Union Now* (1939) and *Union Now With Britain* (1941).

Born in California, Missouri, he moved to Western Montana while he was still a youth and graduated from Montana State University. He also studied at the Sorbonne and was a Rhodes scholar. He has received several honorary degrees, in addition to an LL.D. from Colby, 1941, and D.Litt. from Oberlin, in 1940.

During World War I, Mr. Streit served as a sergeant in the Intelligence Service attached to the American Delegation to the Peace Conference. From 1920-24, he was foreign correspondent for the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* in Paris, the Near East, and Italy. From 1925-39, he reported for the *New York Times* on the Carthage excavations, the Rift War, and other European news. He was Vienna correspondent from 1925-27 and from 1929-39 was League of Nations correspondent.

He is the editor of *Freedom and Union*, a new monthly magazine, begun in October, 1946.

STEPHEN FOWLER CHADWICK—Mr. Chadwick is former national commander of the American Legion.

With LL.B. degrees from Washington and Lee University and the University of Washington, Mr. Chadwick has followed the practice of law in Seattle since 1915. During World War I, he was a first lieutenant in the infantry with the American Expeditionary Forces in Siberia. He served as judge advocate of the Forty & Eight from 1922 to 1924. Active in affairs of the American Legion, he was a member of its Americanism Committee for eight years and chairman for three years. This led to his election as National Commander in 1938.

Since 1931, Mr. Chadwick has been a trustee of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce. Since 1933, he has been civilian aide to the Secretary of War.

PETER H. ODEGARD—Dr. Odegard, president of Reed College, Portland, Oregon, and formerly consulting expert to the Secretary of the Treasury, has distinguished himself in the field of government.

Born in Kalispell, Montana, in 1901, he graduated from New York Military Academy in 1919, and subsequently received the following academic degrees: A.B., University of Washington, 1922; A.M., 1923; Ph.D., Columbia, 1928; honorary A.M., Amherst College, 1939. He was lecturer in government at Columbia, 1924-25; an instructor, 1925-28; assistant professor of government at Williams College, 1928-30; and professor of political science at Ohio State University, 1930-38. From 1941-44, he was consulting expert to the Secretary of the Treasury. In August, 1945, he assumed the presidency at Reed College.

Dr. Odegard is a contributor to professional journals and is associate editor of *Public Opinion Quarterly*. He has written several books, among them *Presure Politics—The Story of the Anti-Saloon League*; *The American Public Mind*, 1930; *American Politics—A Study in Political Dynamics* (with E. A. Helms), 1938; *Peace or War*, 1937; and *Dictatorship in the Modern World*, 1939.

CHARLES R. SAVAGE — A businessman and a labor consultant, Mr. Savage was born on a farm near LaFarge, Wisconsin, in 1906. He was educated in high school and by special courses of instruction.

Beginning as a business agent for a construction firm, he later established his own business and became partner in a logging concern and engaged in the work of that industry.

Mr. Savage served as representative in the Washington state legislature, 1938-1940, and 1942; and was a member of the 79th Congress (1945-47) from the third Washington district. He is an active official of labor unions and is also active in civic organizations.

Under such circumstances, no organization could guarantee security and protection to any nation. Thus, the organization could not be effective.

The only thing left to do would be to arm to the limit. After that there would be two big armies raring at each other and all that would be needed would be a little attack on some country's Pearl Harbor, and we would be off again to a bigger and more deadly war, a germ war, an atomic war. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Savage, and congratulations to all four speakers for staying within their time. Now before we take our questions from this fine Seattle audience of more than five thousand people, I'd like to say for the benefit of the radio audience here that this is one of the loveliest stages we've ever had for us on any Town Meeting. It is banked with beautiful flowers from the Seattle Park Commission, and banked with beautiful evergreens behind that, and at the very crux is this gorgeous scene of magnificent Mount Rainier in all its glory. (*Applause.*)

Will you gentlemen join me up here around the microphone for a brief discussion before we start with the questions from the audience? Mr. Streit, I believe we haven't heard from you for a while.

Mr. Streit: Well, Mr. Chadwick believes that we need to have all

of the nations, outside of Russia, to have enough power to deal with the situation. And President Odegard over here says that we have to have Russia to have that power.

I would like to give just a few figures on what power you would get, President Odegard, by combining by Federal Union only 15 of them. You would get 91 per cent of the naval power of the world, and you would get 95 per cent of the rubber—let me quote just a few figures and then I want to ask you a question on it—95 per cent of the rubber, of the nickel, 90 per cent of the motor car production, 80 per cent of the sulphur, and I could go on down the list—iron, steel, wood pulp, wool, lead—

President Odegard: Could I interrupt, Mr. Streit, and ask you to include in those figures the uranium deposits upon which the future salvation of our civilization may rest?

Mr. Streit: The uranium deposits would be in Canada for this. Do you know of uranium deposits in the Soviet Union?

Dr. Odegard: I don't know how much uranium is deposited in the Soviet Union. I doubt if anyone else does. I doubt if they know how much uranium is deposited in other parts of the world. We've only recently begun to search for it.

Mr. Denny: Go ahead, Mr. Streit. Let Mr. Streit ask the question and then you comment on it,

Dr. Odegard. Both of these fellows are regular forum speakers, and they can hardly stay away from the microphone. Go ahead, Mr. Streit.

Mr. Streit: Well, my question is, with all the colossal power that these 15 democracies would have if they were united, how can you say that no one can reasonably believe that the world needs Russia in it to be organized effectively?

Dr. Odegard: In answering your question, I believe that the democracies of the world should draw closer together. I believe that there are certain things that they can accomplish without Russia. I said that in my speech. I do not, however, believe that without Russia and the Russian satellites, which embrace somewhere in the neighborhood not of three hundred but of nearly five hundred million people—and that does not include India and China, which are in doubt in your line-up—without those people or those nations in a world organization, we cannot be sure of preserving peace in this day of self-propelled projectiles and particularly in this day of the atomic bomb.

With Russia outside the world organization, we will abandon all hope of getting effective control of atomic energy. I believe that difficult as it is to get it—and I wish that Russia would get “yes” in her vocabulary—the only chance we have is to continue to strive

for a system of effective control including Soviet Russia, hard as that may be. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Streit: Well, Dr. Odegard, it seems to me that we are getting pretty close together, then, for forum discussion, because I am in favor of two types of organization. As I said, I am *not* in favor of excluding Russia from *one* organization. I am in favor of getting all the nations in one organization and recognizing the fact that such an organization will be too loose to be effective in keeping the peace, and I would tighten within it the relations between the democracies. It seems to me that that is what you were saying, are we in agreement here for once?

Dr. Odegard: You see, Clarence, has me on the hip because I know that I have long advocated a federal union of the world.

Mr. Chadwick: Both you fellows believe in a monopoly. On your own right, I can see that because you have held the microphone here for quite a while. I want to ask Mr. Savage in these five minutes that he says that a good world government will do, just how are you going to get Russia to agree to any one of the five of them? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Savage: In the first place you have got to establish confidence that the world organization is going to protect her from attack from our nation and she has already agreed with us on a pr

gram—a quota—of uranium for atomic energy for peacetime pursuits. We're getting closer to outlawing atomic bombs.

Mr. Chadwick: Don't you think she's adopted a sweet way of going about it? When we started in talking on this subject, she had a hundred and eighty million people. Now she has impressed within her sphere, according to Dr. Odegard, five hundred million people. Isn't it about time the rest of us got a little closer together to stop this onward march? (*Applause.*)

Dr. Odegard: It seems to me that the policy of the United States ought to have as one of its primary objectives the containment of the expansion of an aggressive Communist government in Russia. I agree with Mr. Chadwick on that. I agree also that we should try to get rid of the veto power in the United Nations, but I want to ask Mr. Chadwick, who attributed the veto to Soviet Russia, if he believes for one minute that the Charter of the United Nations would have gotten by the United States Senate if it hadn't been for a veto provision in it?

Mr. Chadwick: I believe that the Charter of the United Nations would have gotten by the United States Senate and by the people of America, after this war, if they had put the issue up to the American people. (*Applause.*)

Dr. Odegard: We will have that question, I think, resolved — not by Mr. Chadwick or by me—in the course, I hope, of the next few weeks, when the Ferguson-Judd proposal to revise the Charter in that direction comes up before the United States Senate. I certainly hope that Mr. Chadwick is right.

Mr. Denny: All right. Now we haven't had a question from Mr. Savage yet.

Mr. Savage: I wanted to ask Mr. Chadwick how he is going to protect the organized countries, if he organizes all the countries but Russia into a peace organization, and they play down war and play up peace, and become somewhat disarmed, and allow Russia free to produce bombs and germ war and prepare to attack the rest of the world? To leave her alone is going to allow her to be free to attack the rest of the world without him having anything to say about reducing her production for war. How are you going to protect all the rest of the countries from Russia under that kind of a setup?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Chadwick.

Mr. Chadwick: Well, we aren't going to be able to do it—maybe. We don't know. That's up to Russia. Russia has not extended herself in any way yet to show us that she is unable to protect herself or needs the protection of anybody else in the ideology which

she is endeavoring to impress upon the world.

Well, if she wants to come halfway, the opportunity exists within the United Nations. If not, all we can do is to contain ourselves, to develop our strength, to maintain that police force which you talk about, and maintain it big enough—mainly to control Russia—until something happens that you don't contemplate. You talk about friction between two blocks. There is such a thing as internal combustion, and our best hope is that internal combustion may yet take place in Russia. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Chadwick. Now while our speakers get ready for our question period, I am sure that you, our listeners, will be interested in the following message. But first, let's pause for station identification.

Announcer: Yes, friends, you are listening to the nation's favorite radio forum, America's Town Meeting of the Air, discussing the subject, "Can We Have an Effective World Organization Without Russia?" We are about to begin our question period when Clarence Streit, Dr. Peter Odegard, Stephen Chadwick, and Charles R. Savage will answer questions put to them by this representative Seattle audience.

It is part of the Town Hall plan to have these Town Meeting programs originate, approximately half the time each year, in different cities throughout the country so that we may have a truly American audience. We are now on our western tour, and will originate programs during the next two and a half months in Vancouver, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, Phoenix, Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Fe, Albuquerque, Dallas, and Kansas City, returning home to Town Hall, October 7.

For your convenience, copies of tonight's broadcast, including the questions and answers to follow, will be printed in our Town Meeting Bulletin, which you may secure by sending 10 cents to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, to cover the cost of printing and mailing. We are also very happy to announce that in tomorrow's issue of the *New York Herald Tribune* you will find an excellent four-column summary of tonight's Town Meeting, including the questions and answers to follow. The *Herald Tribune* does this each week as a public service to a better informed America.

And now for our question period, we return to Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Now then, friends, everyone in tonight's audience is eligible to win a \$210 set of *Encyclopedia Americana*. If you limit your questions to 25 words and our local committee of judges considers it best for bringing out facts and broadening the scope of this discussion, a set of *Encyclopedia Americana* will be yours.

Man: Mr. Savage, as a businessman, you sponsor an individual to your organization. You put him in power. He vilifies your name, he upsets your organization, he defies you and your organization, uprooting the very foundation. Would you retain him?

Mr. Savage: Well, no, but I don't see much comparison between that question and whether or not we can have an effective world organization without Russia.

Mr. Denny: I believe that the analogy that he was talking about was Russia. Do you care to comment on his analogy?

Mr. Savage: Well, you can fire a man that's working for you, but you can't fire Russia—you can't get her out of the world. She's our neighbor, and we are going to have to live in the same world with her. Now we've got two choices: either to get along in this world, or cause ourselves to die from the latest invention—atomic energy. And I don't believe that it's possible to fire Russia out of

existence like you could an employee.

Mr. Denny: I thank you. Now the gentleman over here. Thank you.

Man: Will the Marshall Plan make a divided nation of the United Nations?

Mr. Streit: I would answer yes, in the sense that some people say that the plan that I have been proposing tonight divides the world into two camps. That does it just as much, only you do not put the same amount of strength behind freedom and behind peace that you would by forming not simply a European union, as the Marshall Plan tends to do, but forming a transatlantic union with ourselves in it.

Man: I heard Dr. Odegard say that he wanted collaboration of the Russians, and I also heard Mr. Savage say that this is necessary to escape from the atom bomb. Now do they both forget that our late President Roosevelt admonished them to banish the word fear? Now, are we not the prize exhibitors when our delegates kow-tow so much to every whim of Stalin and Molotov?

Mr. Denny: Dr. Odegard, will you tackle that question please? Now, please limit your questions to twenty-five words. It is possible.

Dr. Odegard: No one in this

world would like to banish fear from the world so much as I, as one who is interested in education and in the pursuit of truth and of knowledge. We cannot survive in a world obsessed with fear. So that part of your question seems to admit only of a self-evident answer.

Now as to the accusation that we kow-tow to Russia on every instance. That isn't my impression. We have not yielded to Russia on the Atomic Energy Commission. We have not yielded to Russia in our desire to organize Western Europe. We have not yielded to Russia in countless other instances, and I'm glad we haven't.

I hope we won't. I hope some day the Russians will show just a little elementary intelligence and try to recapture the good will of mankind. (*Applause.*)

Lady: Clarence Streit. You mention a union of nations already strong and fairly self-sufficient. Are you offering the weak countries any more than a change of bosses?

Mr. Streit: Well, if you consider that there is a parallel between power behind the freest countries and power behind the most dictatorial countries—if you are going to put a dictator such as Stalin on the same level as our own free system here, and call them the same kind of boss, then I must say that we speak an entirely different language.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over there.

Man: I should like to direct this question to Stephen Chadwick. How can it properly be called a world organization without the participation of one of the large nations?

Mr. Chadwick: That was discussed by us today and is probably quibbling over the minutiae with reference to the subject before us.

We are the people of America or we are the free, or we are the citizens of the world, and we are taking the long-term view. We believe that an organization of the citizens of the world who respect freedom, were it not a world organization to begin with, would of necessity become one, because freedom is, in our opinion, inherent in the heart of man.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Savage, do you want to comment on that?

Mr. Savage: Yes, sir. I was going to say that Mr. Chadwick's program would be all right if we weren't wiped out before we got to that stage.

Mr. Chadwick: There we are surrendering to fear again, and seeking a program of appeasement. I would rather live and die a free man than to surrender to the which would destroy my freedom. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: The gentleman down there on the aisle with forehead almost as high as the moderator's.

Man: Mr. Streit. Isn't the Socialist whip and the state Socialist co-operative societies of the Scandinavian countries, and also the possibility of France and Italy, the postwar trend? Wouldn't that indicate that those countries are closer to Soviet Russia than they are to capitalistic America?

I'm speaking now of the dictatorship of Russia which is the continuation of the dictatorship of the Czarist capitalist. Isn't there a trend closer to Socialism than an affiliation towards capitalism of the United States?

Mr. Streit: There is a trend toward Socialism in western Europe in the states you mentioned, but to say that that means a trend toward Soviet Russia on their part to assimilate the Socialists of western Europe with the Communists of Russia, is an error of the first magnitude, I would say.

It depends there again on what importance you attach, whether you attach importance to the economics alone, or whether you attach it to human liberty.

Now, the Socialists in western Europe are in favor of reorganizing the economic system and maintaining civil liberty, and doing it by methods of civil liberty. They are not in favor of doing it that way in Communist Russia. The communist program is one of achieving these changes by violent revolution.

That is the important thing to me, and in that respect, certainly the people of western Europe are way over on our side. Anyone need only read the newspapers to see that the split is already there in Europe between eastern Europe, that is dominated by the Communist dictatorship, and western Europe, where there is, as you say, a strong Socialist movement. The split is over there. And the western part is depending on us with its hopes based on what the United States can do to help them along.

Lady: Dr. Odegard. Would not forming a world organization without Russia be the quickest way to bring her in and prove the effectiveness of the organization?

Mr. Denny: Dr. Odegard. I'm afraid she asked the question of the wrong man.

Dr. Odegard: The question is would not the organization of a world without Russia be the quickest and most effective way of bringing Russia within the world organization? That is kind of starting backwards, I think. Russia is now a member of the United Nations. She has ratified the Charter of the United Nations. It is not necessary now to organize some new body in order to bring her in.

Mr. Denny: The lady is not satisfied with your answer. She wants to talk back.

Lady: This is what I asked. I asked if forming a world organi-

zation without Russia would not be the quickest way to bring her in and prove the effectiveness of the organization?

Mr. Denny: He got your question all right. His answer is no. (*Laughter.*)

Dr. Odegard: My answer is not no, because the lady begs the question. She assumes that you can have a world organization without Russia and her satellites. That I do not believe. You can have a certain kind of organization without Russia and her satellites, but you cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, whether of Mr. Chadwick's or Mr. Streit's, make that a world organization. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: No, now wait a minute, Dr. Odegard. Now, the lady may beg the question, but she didn't say we could have a world organization without Russia. She said shouldn't we have one without Russia as a means of bringing Russia in. I guess her assumption is that if you had a world organization without her, Russia wouldn't like to be on the outside and therefore would temper her opinion and come in.

Dr. Odegard: Could I just comment before Mr. Streit takes the mike. That raises the question of the terms on which Russia is to come into this organization from which you are going to exclude her. She is now in on the terms set forth in the Charter of the United Nations.

I grant you that she has too faithfully lived up to the terms of that Charter, and it would be better if she did, but I can't see that we gain anything by excluding her in the hope that by including her she will come back.

I honestly can't see that we have made much progress in the direction of a more effective world organization.

It seems to me that we might proceed along the lines of Mr. Streit, and suggest two organizations—that's possible under the United Nations Charter—one of which we could implement the Marshall Plan for Europe, and another of which we could implement many other limited goals and limited objectives in the economic and social sphere without affecting the essential validity of the principles of the world organization as embodied in the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Streit.

Mr. Streit: I want to say that I agree with the lady. That brings up a point that I did not have time to include in my statement. It is simply this—that though, for practical reasons, one must begin with a few like-minded democracies, if you are to federate them effectively, once you have such a sound constitution, the example of our own thirteen original states proves that many less experienced people can be added gradually to the union.

By this process the new Union would become ever more powerful as an agency for peace. Effective union with Russia—with the Russian people—which is now so impractical and impossible, would thus become practicable eventually.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over here.

Man: My question, what true psychological effect would it have upon world organization for lasting peace if we could and did get along without Russia or any nation?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Chadwick. About fifteen seconds.

Mr. Chadwick: True psychological effect of success, I understand, breeds success, and if such an organization were successful, its psychological effect upon the Russian people would be one which would prompt them, perhaps, to a rebirth of liberty, a re-expression of their inherent thoughts and desires, and we'd be making progress toward world order. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Chadwick. Now while our speakers prepare their summaries for tonight's discussion, here's a message of interest to you.

Announcer: On our travels about the country, people keep asking the question, "What is this Town Hall to which you refer. Isn't Town Meeting just another radio program produced in a studio that you call Town Hall?"

Well, no. Town Hall is an educational institution, established in 1894, and when you're in New York, you may visit the Town Hall building at 123 West Forty-third Street, just off Times Square. Town Hall conducts the oldest lecture program in the country, as well as a new program of short courses designed for adults. Town Hall is also the busiest concert hall in America.

Town Hall and the American Broadcasting Company, then a part of NBC, began producing America's Town Meeting twelve years ago on May 30, 1935. For further information about Town Hall, address the secretary, Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

And now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, here is Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: We hear first from Dr. Peter Odegard.

Dr. Odegard: In attempting to summarize the position we have taken tonight, I'm not sure that I can speak completely for Mr. Savage, but speaking as nearly as I can for what I heard, I would say that we would agree on this.

That a world organization, to be true to its name, must embrace the world.

Secondly, that ultimately, we hope that a world organization will become a federal world union of peoples and not merely a world union of governments.

Third, because we believe it must include every country in its jurisdiction, we believe it cannot have jurisdiction over every thing.

Fourth, in the United States Constitution, the national government is one of delegated powers. The other powers are reserved to the states. We believe that in a world organization that is to function properly, this relationship would also exist. That then raises the question as to what powers should be delegated to the world organization and what should be reserved.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Dr. Odegard. Now, for the final summary by Mr. Clarence Streit.

Mr. Streit: There have been many more questions put here by hands raised than we had time to answer. There have been many more on the vast radio audience—questions that have been unanswered here, but if any of them were up my street, I just want to extend an invitation to you to send them in to me at Washington, D.C., in care of Federal Union, and I'll do my best to answer them.

Now, I want to sum up as much as I can, for Mr. Chadwick. He believes that we can get an effective world organization by amending the Charter and taking all the nations that want to go along with us, without Russia. Various objections have been brought to that by the negative.

If they have made weight with you, I want to put forward a compromise proposal—where you don't have to drive Russia out of the United Nations, where you get all the power that you would ask more by Mr. Chadwick's system by uniting the democracies with that United Nations, not making Soviet Russia the bad boy and putting her in the corner, or anything like that; keeping that organization as we have the Pan-American League and then organizing with it a powerful Federal Union. There is a system that has worked in our own history, and it can work on a world scale if we will put it on a world scale.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Clarence Streit, Peter Odegard, Stephen Chadwick, and Charles Savary. And our thanks, also, to our host and sponsor, Friedlander and Sons of Seattle, and Station KJR for their generous hospitality. If you, our listeners, want a copy of tonight's program, remember you can secure it by sending ten cents to Town Hall, New York 18.

Now, next week we cross the border into the land of our good neighbor, Canada, where we'll be the guests of the Canadian Town Meeting under the direction of Mr. Arthur Helps, in Vancouver, British Columbia. Our subject will be "What Should Be Our Policy in Aiding Europe Now?" In other words, a discussion of the Marshall Plan.

Our speakers will be Major General George Randolph Pearkes, V. C., Member of Parliament, from Nanaimo; and Mrs. Dorothy Steeves, Vice-President of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation; Mr. Robert W. Kenny, attorney of Los Angeles; and Dr. Wilson Compton, President of the Washington State College.

I am informed that our local committee of judges has awarded

a set of *Encyclopedia Americana* to an unnamed person who asked the question: "Would not the formation of a world organization without Russia be the quickest way to bring her in and prove the effectiveness of the organization?" Congratulations, young lady.

So plan to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's bell. (*Applause.*)



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last

VOLUME 12

34. Is World Disarmament Possible Now?
35. Would You Rather Live in a Small Town or a Big City?
36. Would You Like To Turn the Clock Back?
37. Should We Have Labor-Management Courts To Settle Labor Disputes?
38. Should Rent Ceilings Be Lifted?
39. Can We Have a 25% Wage Boost Without Raising Prices?
40. How Can Atomic Energy Be Used and Controlled?
43. Should Congress Outlaw the Closed Shop?
44. How Can We Get and Keep Good Teachers in Our Schools?
45. What Should Be Our Program for Germany at the Moscow Conference?
48. How Should the Democracies Meet the Challenge of Spreading Communism?
49. Should the Communist Party Be Outlawed in the United States?
50. Do We Really Elect Our Own President?

51. Are Cooperatives a Threat to Private Enterprise?
52. Does Our New Foreign Policy Lead to Peace or War?

VOLUME 13

1. What Should We Do About Communism Now?
2. What Can We Do To Get More Housing?
3. Should We Continue the "Voice of America" Broadcasts to Foreign Countries?
4. How Can We Avoid an Economic Bust?
5. How Can We Strengthen the American Family?
6. Are Communism and Christianity Incompatible?
7. What Should We Do About Population and Rents?
8. Should We Admit 400,000 of Europe's Homeless Now?
9. How Can We Halt the Spread of Russian Power in Europe?
10. Has Twentieth Century Civilization Improved Mankind?
11. Will the Taft-Hartley Law Improve Labor Relations in Industry?
12. Is Universal Military Training Necessary for Our Security?

Order single copies at 10c each from TOWN HALL, INC.,
123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate: } 26 Weeks for C
\$2.35
Single Copies